

**REMARKS:**

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1-20 are allowable over the teachings of what he has determined to be the closest prior art references. These references include Ender (United States Patent 3,287,291), Nakamura et al (United States Patent 5,973,067), and Britton (United States Patent 5,618,951). However, the Examiner has objected to claims 6-16 and 17-20 on the basis of certain informalities.

The Examiner suggested it would be better to renumber the structural formulas provided in claim 6 as (5) through (14). Claim 6 has been redrafted in this manner as new claim 22 (so as to avoid confusion that could result from the brackets contained in the structural formulas provided in claim 6).


The Examiner has also objected to claims 17-20 and has suggested that "wherein at least one of the members selected from the group consisting of R, R', and R" is a hydroxyl group" be changed to "wherein at least one of R, R', and R" is a hydroxyl group." Such an amendment has been made to these claims.

Claims 1-5 and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner made this rejection on the basis that in Formula 4 in claim 1 when Y is C(R)R', the monomer represented by Formula 4 is not a silyl-acetal compound and is different from the compounds represented by Formula 1-3 because the acetal is defined as RO-C(R)<sub>2</sub>-OR. To overcome this problem, the Y group in Formula 4 of claim 1 has been changed to Y' wherein Y' is defined as being a member selected from the group consisting of oxygen, sulfur, nitrogen, and phosphorus. Accordingly, Y' in Formula 4 of claim 1 cannot represent a C(R)R'. Claim 1 has been redrafted in this manner as new claim 21 (so as to avoid confusion that could result from the brackets contained in the structural formulas provided in claim 1).

It is believed that all of the amendments made herein overcome the Examiner's objections. Since all of the claims pending in the subject patent application are allowable over the teachings of the closest prior art references, it is believed that the subject patent application is

now in a condition for allowance and such an allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)

Alvin T Rockhill, Reg. No. 30,417  
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, D/823  
1144 East Market Street  
Akron, Ohio 44316-0001  
Telephone: (330) 666-4659